

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed February 27, 2004. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1 and 21-49 are pending. Claims 1, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 31-33, 36, 40, 45, and 49 are amended. New claims 50-57 have been added. Therefore, claims 1 and 21-57 are presented for examination.

Claims 27-31, 35, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims to provide antecedent basis for the terminology used. With respect to claim 28, the term which is being used is "information object" rather than "information." Claim 1 provides antecedent basis for the term "information object." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 21-28, 30-36, 39, 42-46, 49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), (e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,544,305 issued to Ohmaye, et al. Examiner rejected claims 29, 37, 38, 40, 41, 47, 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5, 544,305 issued to Ohmaye, et al.

Ohmaye discusses a system for creating interpersonal computer simulations, which allow a user to interact with characters simulated by a computer. There are two parties, the programmer and the user who interacts with the completed program. Ohmaye optimizes his system to enable a non-technical programmer to create the computer simulation. When the simulation is run, the user enters a message in response to a statement presented by a computer-simulated character. After the user has entered a message, the computer analyzes it to determine which subsequent statement should next be presented to the user. The user is not attempting to input a keyword, and does not recognize the presence of

keywords. Furthermore, the user does not receive any feedback about his or her statement before it is submitted to the simulation, but rather only receives a result in the form of a response statement from a simulated character.

Additionally, in Ohmaye the user's statement is only parsed once it is dispatched, after it is completed. The Examiner suggests that column 3, lines 11-28 suggest that Ohmaye detects a keyword upon completion of a keyword. However, the cited section of Ohmaye states that the system "analyzes the input from the user" and "parses the input." It does not teach or suggest parsing the statement prior to its dispatch. In fact, at column 26, line 52-55, Ohmaye states that "If in step 326 the user has input a statement, the engine 42 compares the statement to the acceptable statement objects of the grammar object referenced by the message bubble object, in step 328." Therefore, since grammatical analysis is done, the entire statement must be parsed together. Thus, Ohmaye does not teach or suggest detecting a keyword immediately upon completion of that keyword.

Furthermore, because their purposes are very different, the interactive simulations described by Ohmaye differ in fundamental ways from the apparatus described by the Applicants. In Ohmaye, only "acceptable statements" (which must include one or more keywords) entered by the user can be processed by the system. In one embodiment of the present system, as recited in claim 52, any message entered can be processed, even if no keyword is present, either by the system assigning by default a particular information object to do the processing, or by the operator selecting one manually. In Ohmaye, any text included in a statement which is not a keyword is allowed only if it occurs where "wild card" text is allowed in a statement, otherwise it is discarded. Thus, Ohmaye does not provide for entering arbitrary text for the system to operate upon.

Claim 24 points out that in one embodiment text other than the keyword is treated as variable data for processing by the selected information object. If a statement without a keyword, or with text other than a keyword is entered by the user of the Ohmaye system where no wildcard symbol indicates such text is allowed, the system simply fails. (Ohmaye,

Figure 16, step 328.) Additionally, the user cannot create “aliases” for keywords, since the user is not aware of keywords. When reading Ohmaye, one must separate out the user, who interacts with the program, and the programmer who creates the program. The present invention, as claimed, is focused on the interaction of a user with a system. Therefore, Applicants will focus on the interaction between the user and the computer program in Ohmaye. The Examiner references Figure 6 of Ohmaye. However, Figure 6 is addressing the interactions of the author, i.e. programmer, rather than the user. Therefore, Ohmaye does not teach or suggest the *creation* of such aliases by a user, although the user can *use* an alias by entering a message including a word that has been defined as an alias by the programmer.

Claim 1, as amended recites:

An apparatus for executing an action in response to a message entered by a user in a computer system, the apparatus comprising:
a user input device for receiving an input message from the user;
a parser to identify a keyword in the input message, the parser to associate the input message to an information object associated with the keyword; and
a user output device to provide, prior to the message being sent, an indication of an action to be taken by the associated information object in response to the message from the user.

(Claim 1, as amended). Applicants respectfully submit that Ohmaye does not teach or suggest providing an indication to the user prior to dispatching the message for execution. The user in Ohmaye is an ignorant user, -- unaware of keywords or what the process is that enables the responses of the simulated characters. Therefore, it would be illogical to show an indication of the action to be taken to the user in Ohmaye. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, and claims 21-35 which depend on claim 1, are not anticipated by Ohmaye.

Claim 36, as amended recites:

A system comprising:
an object database including a plurality of information objects, each information object coupled to one or more keywords;
a user interface to receive a user input message;
a parser to parse the user input message to detect one or more keywords and select the related one or more information objects; and

a user output device to provide feedback to the user indicating the action to be taken by the selected one or more identified information objects prior to executing the information object coupled to the detected keyword.

(Claim 36, as amended). Ohmaye does not teach or suggest providing feedback to the user indicating the action to be taken by the selected identified information objects prior to executing the information objects. Rather, Ohmaye keeps the user in the dark about the functioning of the system, and simply presents statements from computer-simulated characters in a cartoon-like format. Therefore, Ohmaye does not teach, nor could it logically include, such a display of feedback. Therefore, claim 36, and claims 37-48 and 50-51 which depend on it, are not anticipated by or obvious over Ohmaye.

Claim 49, as amended recites:

A method to respond to a message comprising:
receiving an input message from a user;
identifying a keyword in the input message;
associating the input message with an information object
associated with the keyword; and
presenting information to the user based on the information object
prior to executing the information object.

(Claim 48, as amended). Ohmaye does not teach or suggest presenting information to the user about the information object prior to executing the information object. Therefore, claim 49 is not anticipated by or obvious over Ohmaye.

Newly added claim 53 recites:

An apparatus for executing action in response to a message entered by a user in a computer system, the apparatus comprising:
a user input device for receiving an input message from the user;
a parser to identify a keyword in the input message, the parser to parse the input message as it is entered to immediately detect a keyword as it is entered, and the parser further to associate the input message to an information object associated with the keyword; and
a user output device to provide information to the user.

(Claim 52). Ohmaye does not teach or suggest parsing the message as it is entered to immediately detect a keyword. Rather, Ohmaye evaluates the entire

message, once it is dispatched by the user by pressing return or clicking on enter.

Therefore, claim 52 is not anticipated by Ohmaye, nor are claims 53-55 which depend on it.

Newly added claim 57 recites:

An system for executing an action in response to a message entered by a user in a computer system, the apparatus comprising
a plurality of keywords, each keyword associated with one or more information object, the execution of the information object causing the action to occur;
a keyword including an alias created by a user, to customize the user's interaction with the system;
a user input device for receiving an input message from the user, the input message including at least one keyword;
a parser to identify the keyword in the input message, the parser to associate the input message to an information object associated with the keyword; and
a user output device to provide feedback to the user.

(Claim 56). Ohmaye does not teach or suggest a keyword including an alias created by the user to customize the user interaction with the system. Rather, Ohmaye permits a programmer to create alternative forms of a keyword, or aliases. This, however, does not customize the user's interaction with the system, but rather increases the likelihood that the statement input by the user, who is unaware of keywords, will happen to include a the keyword. This is directly opposed to claim 56, as the point of the aliases in claim 56 is to enable a user, who knows about keywords, to create an additional keyword as an alias, , to provide an interface customized for that user. Therefore, Ohmaye, who makes no provision for customization by the user, does not anticipate claim 56.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

5/21/09



Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300